

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 to 8, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Wuhrl et al. (US 5,163,012). Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Wuhrl et al. in view of Loffler et al. (US 6,748,860).

We note that the previous listing with the application as filed showed two claim 10s. A new claim listing has been provided properly numbering the claims.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections

Claims 1 to 8, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Wuhrl et al. (US 5,163,012).

Wuhrl discloses a scanning device 12 such as a densitometer 12A, a colorimeter 12B, register measuring device 12C or hand scanner 12D. (See Wuhrl at col. 4, lines 35 to 44).

Claim 1 of the present invention recites “a device graphically superimposing, on printing material printed by the printing material processing machine, data to be displayed.”

With the present invention, data is thus superimposed on the printing material, for example as shown in Fig. 2 by projector 12 projecting data 13 onto printing material 14. See also specification at [0024] for example.

The scanning device 12 of Wuhrl does not superimpose any data onto the printing material, but rather reads data from the printing material. This data may then be displayed on a screen or CRT, but is not superimposed on the printing material.

Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1 to 8, 10 and 11 is respectfully requested.

With further respect to claims 2 and 4, the Office Action identifies another element, camera 7 as a projection device. A camera clearly does not superimpose or project onto the printed material, but rather receives data.

With respect to claims 5 and 6, the single light beam 11C does not project data onto the printed material but merely identifies a location for the operator. See Wuhrl at col. 4, lines 9 to 20. Beams 11A and 11B do not fall on the printed material.

Withdrawal of the rejections to these claims for these reasons as well is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections


Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Wuhrl et al. in view of Loffler et al. (US 6,748,860).

In view of the above with respect to claim 1, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 9 and 10 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By: 
William C. Gehris
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC
485 Seventh Avenue
New York, New York 10018
(212) 736-1940